

moved on, but hundreds at the city's six shelters still need housing.

One hub of activity is Easthaven Southern Baptist Church, a shelter for 110, although for a time it served more than twice that number. Former Cedar Falls resident Merrill Oster initiated the relationship between Prairie Lakes and Easthaven. He learned of Easthaven's challenge from family members at that church. He called friends in the Cedar Valley who were looking for a way to help.

The population in this town of 12,000 has swelled with survivors and relief workers.

Members of the Indiana National Guard, shouldering M16s, are on hand to keep the peace and lend a hand. And then there are the volunteers. Red Cross workers and Christians from Tennessee have moved into Easthaven Baptist Church. And now the Prairie Lakes contingent has arrived.

Prairie Lakes is partnering with Easthaven Baptist Church to help with shelter and a transitional housing project. The Cedar Falls church will send two more teams of volunteers in the next two weeks.

"We kind of answered the call to love people," said Adam Graber, 23, Waterloo.

The warm Mississippi air was thick with humidity and "love bugs" when volunteers started work Wednesday.

Men and women spent hours cutting and raking tall grass at a former trailer home park, preparing the way for 14 travel trailers. The units were purchased by Oster from Ace Fogdall RV.

Oster orchestrated the project Trailers, which will house displaced families, were filled with sheets, pots, pans and other amenities by Prairie Lakes and Cedar Heights Baptist congregations in Cedar Falls in two days.

Kim Oster of Easthaven Baptist, related by marriage to Merrill Oster, said evacuees have brought new life to her church, built specifically eight years ago to serve as a disaster shelter. The joyful but weary servants at Easthaven welcomed help from strangers up north.

"We needed manpower. We really needed people to work," she said.

Trailer lots are rent-free for six months. Organizers hope that is enough time for evacuees to achieve independence. Five homes also are being prepared for family use.

About \$157,000 has been raised toward the \$300,000 project.

On Wednesday, Cedar Valley and Mississippi volunteers began preparations for sewer, water and electricity at the trailer park. At first, workers had trouble locating the existing water line. Some Iowa jaws dropped as a tall and lanky Mississippi man slowly walked back and forth across the grass. Billy Crider strolled with arms outstretched, hands clutching metal sticks that pulled toward an underground line. The former Entergy Corp. employee was retired for more than 5 years when he was called up by his company to help after the hurricane.

Bystander Ron Williamson, a retired area school teacher and volunteer cook at the shelter, vouched for the accuracy of divining rods before ducking away to cook chicken for the evening meal for evacuees and volunteers.

"I love 'em God bless 'em all," Williamson said.

Volunteers are grateful to understanding employers and teachers for letting them serve in the South, and for the sponsorship of their churches.

Sara, 27, and Jerry Steele, 30, of Lytham, England extended a visit with family in Iowa to make the trek south. Delta Airlines let them delay their travel plans without extra fees. Jared Coffin, 14, is missing class at Hoover Middle School in Waterloo. He finished most of his homework on the 16-hour drive south.

"They need people down here to do things like this. They need people to donate clothes. It's just a matter of getting plugged in," Coffin said "We're going to be here for awhile."

Some Cedar Valley volunteers hoped to spend more time in the shelter's kitchen and were surprised to learn more help was available than expected. Some mentioned trekking further south if the need is greater there, added Steve Coffin, 51, of Cedar Falls.

"We're just getting started," said Mark Sherwood, volunteer coordinator from Cedar Falls. "Every day can be different."

Brookhaven experienced tree damage and power outages but was spared the destruction suffered by her southern neighbors.

"We've been inconvenienced, but their lives have changed," said Massingill the mayor. "People are ready to go back to their homes."

But not everyone can.

Despite what the highway signs near Brookhaven say, Kenner, La., evacuees Herbert Lange and his wife, Cynthia, weren't looking for paradise when they arrived at Easthaven Baptist. They just wanted a safe place to wait for the storm to pass and the water to recede so insurance and property issues can be resolved. Housed in a Sunday school room and fed three times a day, the Langes are convinced they have a little piece of heaven.

#### HONORING BARBARA GRASSLEY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, October is Breast Cancer Month, and I wish to honor my wife, who is an 18-year survivor of breast cancer.

I don't often speak about this, but October is the month to raise money and bring attention to the plight of those who have breast cancer, most often with the idea in mind of adding to research for a cure of breast cancer.

My only opportunity to participate in this, besides a few remarks I make, is the second Saturday of October in Des Moines, IA, they have a 5K to raise money. Sixteen thousand of us participated in that 5K fundraiser in Des Moines, IA. I have nothing to brag about because it took me 28 minutes 6 seconds, but I was glad to have the opportunity to help raise money for the cause.

This morning, I would like to read a speech for my wife Barbara Grassley—today happens to be her 73rd birthday—about her personal challenge with breast cancer. Today is my wife's birthday, and it is fitting that we celebrate her victory over this.

Barbara's story is a familiar one. She had many busy years raising our five children, helping run the family farm, particularly during those years that I was in the State legislature, busy participating in community and church activities, and even at age 50 going back and finishing her BA degree at the University of Northern Iowa. Barbara never worried about her own health. Then one casual visit to do a free cholesterol screening led to a doctor's visit for a physical exam. It was an appointment that changed her life. She was diagnosed with breast cancer. Just 10 days later, she had a modified radical mastectomy at Covenant Hos-

pital in Waterloo. That was 18 years ago.

We are fortunate that her breast cancer was detected early. We know with certainty that early detection can dramatically increase a woman's chance of defeating breast cancer. That is true for women like Barbara who have a family medical history working against them. Parenthetically, I think five out of six of my wife's aunts on her mother's side had breast cancer as well.

The need for routine mammograms cannot be repeated too often. Baseline mammograms and regular screening are key to saving the lives of the thousands of women who develop this disease each year.

As her husband and as a Senator, I follow closely the legislative commitment made to breast cancer research, education, and prevention. I am proud to be cosponsor of the Breast Cancer and Environmental Research Act. This bill before the HELP Committee would allow the Director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences to make grants to develop centers across the country. These centers will help conduct research on the environmental factors that may be related to breast cancer. I hope the HELP Committee will consider this bill as soon as possible.

In the meantime, we must focus our efforts on finding a cure. In the past week, there have been breakthroughs on cancer research. Every day, we get one step closer to overcoming this disease.

This month is Breast Cancer Awareness Month. I hope men and women will take the opportunity to talk to their loved ones about getting a mammogram and preventing breast cancer. I hope we can continue to raise awareness of this disease for the sake of every mother, spouse, sister, daughter, and granddaughter in this world.

I remind people especially of the luck of my wife going to that early detection. She went for just one of these community screenings. She didn't go to the doctor with any idea she would have anything wrong; she just went there and there were some questions raised. Every opportunity you have to take a quick one, if there is something wrong that can lead to the routine mammogram, you should do it because that surely made a difference in my wife's condition at the time. Early detection is so important.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho.

#### DEFICIT SPENDING AND COST OF KATRINA

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, for the last few minutes, I have listened with great interest to the Senator from Iowa reading a diary of the experience of a dedicated volunteer, obviously, to help out with Katrina victims in Louisiana and Mississippi. I found it most

fascinating and also most frustrating, as I think the Senator did and certainly the person involved.

I want to also say "happy birthday" to Barbara Grassley. I hope the Senator will communicate that to her. My wife Suzanne and I know Barbara and Chuck well, and I extend a "happy birthday" from the Craig family to Barbara.

While I was home in Idaho this past week, like many of us who were in our home States, I held a series of town meetings across the State. The most often asked question at those open town meeting forums was about deficit spending and the cost of Katrina and the overall concern Idahoans have about Katrina and Katrina victims.

As the Senator from Iowa spoke, it is so true of Idaho and other States across the Nation where tremendous voluntary efforts have poured out in behalf of the citizens of Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas. They have gone through these literally catastrophic experiences of a magnitude that none of us certainly in Idaho have ever experienced.

While that concern is real and the voluntary and contributive effort is of a record like none we have ever seen in our country, I truly believe there is a growing concern about the wise and responsible and careful use of the tax dollars. As Idahoans and Americans send their time and their generosity to the South, we are also sending our tax dollars. Clearly we want them spent carefully and wisely.

Prior to the recess, Congress held hearings to examine the fallacies of the response to Hurricane Katrina. There was much criticism—most of it, in part, from the press and some of it not as well-founded as we find out as expressed at the time—about what was done, what could be done, and what should be done appropriately to handle the literally billions of dollars headed south to help the citizens of those States.

In 5 or 10 years I hope we will not be conducting the same backward-looking hearings on how Federal dollars were spent, how waste, fraud, and abuse occurred in the Gulf States, and how it might have been prevented as we are looking backward today to see why the response to Katrina was so mishandled. Instead of looking back, we are now in a position to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse by acting responsibly now to control and offset Government spending. There are numerous ways for Congress to do this, but perhaps it is noteworthy to first talk about the congressional measures that will not, in my opinion, do it appropriately. Senate bill 1766, the Hurricane Katrina Disaster Relief and Economic Recovery Act, known as the Pelican Project, whatever you call the bill, \$250 billion of what I have examined and referred to as a pork-stuffed package, costing more than the Louisiana Purchase adjusted for inflation, is not the way to go.

Some of the more noteworthy "relief provisions" in the bill include \$8 million for an alligator farm, \$25 million for sugarcane research and, of course, the \$35 million to restore the seafood industry. At this time, it is questionable whether Federal tax dollars ought to be spent in those categories. However, overshadowing all of that, and what is worse, is the bill's whopping \$40 billion requested not by but for the Army Corps of Engineers projects, many of which were unrelated to the flood projects or the flood protection.

To put this in perspective, the overall national Army Corps of Engineers budget for fiscal year 2005 was \$4 billion, one-tenth of what was proposed for Louisiana. The Louisiana tradition of overreaching Corps projects makes this request, I guess, a little less surprising.

Take, for example, the Industrial Canal lock navigation project in New Orleans. In 2000, the Corps launched a \$750 million lock navigation project on the Industrial Canal in New Orleans, the most expensive single lock project in history. The Corps justified its massive project by predicting barge traffic on the canal would increase when traffic, in fact, was decreasing, and had decreased 50 percent since 1988. Despite the economic and social concerns the project posed, Louisiana consistently welcomed it. The Industrial Canal has received more than \$70 million over the last few years. In the 2006 budget, the President provided no funding for the Industrial Canal. However, the House—that is right—and this Senate pumped nearly \$15 million into the project.

If we are wondering where the money came from, one of the programs the Senate cut in the same year was the one of the national priority projects. That is, the west bank and vicinity hurricane protection project of New Orleans. We cut that to do something else. Indeed, one of the levees that lined the Industrial Canal failed after Hurricane Katrina hit, inundating the lower Ninth Ward of New Orleans with floodwater. Yet that is where the money was cut to fund the canal itself.

Louisiana has never suffered from a lack of Army Corps funding. Over the last 5 years the State reportedly has received \$1.9 billion in Corps funds, far more than any other State. If Hurricane Katrina stood for anything other than Mother Nature's catastrophic power, it is Louisiana, in my opinion, and the catastrophic failure to prioritize public interest projects over what now appears to be pork.

S. 1776 is no different. The bill's working group on Corps response projects was dominated by special interest lobbyists, with one insider reportedly expressing concern that the focus was not on protecting Louisiana. In addition, the bill would exempt any Corps projects from provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act and the Clean Water Act and it would also waive the usual Corps cost-sharing requirements, thus making taxpayers

foot the entire bill. At a time of catastrophic emergency, I would be willing to look at something such as that. At the same time, these are material dollars that are going. Clearly, they deserve our oversight.

The taxpayer has already paid, dutifully and dearly, for Katrina relief. Thus far, \$62.3 billion in emergency supplemental funding has been authorized for immediate relief and response needs for victims of Katrina. However, the Federal Government's role in disaster relief, as provided by existing law, is only one of support to State and local governments and agencies. The Stafford Act, which provides the statutory framework for Presidential declaration of an emergency or major disaster, explicitly states that Federal resources should supplement, not replace, State and local resources for disaster relief.

We understand the magnitude and we understand, in the case of Mississippi and Louisiana, major wipeouts of a kind we have never seen before. But still, let's not change the laws and the relationships. Let's keep the balance in mind as this Congress decides, and I hope tracks and, most importantly, monitors where those dollars go and how they will be spent.

With an act of supplementary spending also comes the duty of offsetting. Before Hurricane Katrina, the Federal Budget Office projected the 2005 deficit would total \$331 billion. The picture, of course, is only bleaker now. Numerous groups have offered comprehensive savings proposals that would offset the massive costs of Katrina relief.

The Republican Study Committee, the Congressional Budget Office, the General Accounting Office, Citizens Against Government Waste, the Cato Institute, American Enterprise, the Heritage Foundation, all have come up with a variety of proposals not to deficit spend all of it but to see some reasonable belt tightening at the Federal level and some—not all—of the disaster relief being able to come out of current budgets.

In addition to these savings proposals, the Senate majority leader recently proposed a rescission package that would rescind unnecessary spending. A few weeks ago, President Bush became directly involved when he called on Congress to enact his proposed cuts in both mandatory and discretionary spending. There is little we can change about Katrina. Yet the focus still seems to be on finding who is responsible for the response or the lack of response. We are always responsible for the health of our Government, for the wise use of hard-earned taxpayer dollars, and for ensuring that America's future generations do not foot the bill for all of the current fiscal recklessness. The spending will be the subject of both public and Government scrutiny for future years, but we can prevent any of the waste or the fraud or abuse of those moneys that will occur or could occur.

That job is now. That is our responsibility as a Congress. I urge my colleagues to work with the Senators from Louisiana and Mississippi. Clearly, the need is real, and no one in any way denies that. But there is a responsibility here, a fundamental responsibility, as we literally send billions upon billions of dollars south to rebuild and reshape and refurbish the economies of those States, that those dollars be spent wisely, that those dollars be spent cautiously, and that no one individual benefit in an extraordinary, abusive, or fraudulent way. That is the responsibility of this Congress that I take most sincerely and I know most of my colleagues do.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for such time as I may consume.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE TRADE DEFICIT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my colleagues, Senators ALEXANDER and BINGAMAN, have been to the floor to describe a publication that has now been provided to all 100 Senators. It is by the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine, entitled "Rising Above the Gathering Storm, Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future." They have spoken about this report with justifiable pride. They did instigate some of the best scientific minds to ask and answer the question: Are we losing our scientific edge and what would it mean if we did and what do we do to get it back?

Part of this country's long-term opportunity and the opportunity to create a middle class in a country with an economy unlike any other in the world has been technology, science, knowledge, and education. The question is: Are we losing our edge? The answer in this report is: Yes, we are. Then it describes a number of ways to put together an approach that would deal with that. While I think this is very helpful, it is the first chapter of a rather lengthy book, the book about what is happening in our country. It reminds me of the movie "How Stella Got Her Groove Back." Has America lost its groove?

This country has done so much. This is the country that split the atom, spliced genes. We have been inventive.

We have invented everything: Plastics, the silicon chip, radar. We cured smallpox, polio. We invented the telephone, the computer, television. We built airplanes, learned how to fly them. We built rockets and walked on the moon. Particularly in the last 100 years, America has been extraordinary in what it has done. It is standing on one another's shoulders, looking over the horizon and building and inventing and creating. Has America lost its groove? That is not the title of my remarks, but that was the question that was asked. The answer is in the covers of a lengthy report saying, among other things, we have to change our education system. We have to educate more engineers. It says that the Chinese and the folks from India are educating far more engineers than we are, and that is going to have an impact. We need greater teaching of science in our schools. I don't disagree with any of that. This is a significant contribution to a debate that we should have about new public policy.

But none of this means anything unless we also talk about the conditions under which we are exporting America's jobs and, yes, exporting good jobs, scientific jobs, technical jobs to other countries. If you triple the number of engineers educated in America and then discover that in the country of India you can hire five engineers for every engineer you pay in this country—and we continue to see an exodus of jobs out of this country to two countries, India and China—of what value has been tripling the number of engineers in America?

That brings me to the central point of what I wanted to talk about briefly today, or perhaps not so briefly because it is Friday. Nobody seems to be crowding people here on the floor. What I want to talk about is the issue of international trade and a trade policy that perhaps much more than the issue of losing the edge in science and technology, is injuring this country and pulling the foundation out from under the future of all the kids now in college and high school.

Let me describe some of this with some charts. This is our trade deficit. As you can see, this is a sea of red ink. Year after year we see our trade deficit grows worse and worse. It is now at about \$700-plus billion a year. That means for every single day, 7 days a week, every single day we buy \$2 billion more in goods from other countries than we sell. That means, at the end of the year, we have a trade deficit. This year we expect a trade deficit of about \$750 billion. Add to that the roughly \$550 billion in fiscal policy budget deficits—that is the amount that the Federal debt increased in the last year—and you are talking about a Federal indebtedness of \$1.2 trillion. You would think that people would have an apoplectic seizure about that, understanding its consequences. But we just snore through it all, having pleasant dreams and a soft, little sleep.

Nobody seems to care much. You would at least think that those people who are self-defined conservatives, wearing flinty gray suits and steel rim glasses and having the banker impetus that conservatives used to have, would say: This has to stop. A country can't run a \$1.2 trillion indebtedness and expect to have a better future. But there is dead silence.

The only people who talk about this portion of the deficit are Fritz Hollings—he sat here. He is gone. Fritz left—I have been out here. Senator BYRD has from time to time. Otherwise, there is vast silence.

I want to talk through some of this. I want to tell you about the trade deficit with China because this is almost one-third of our deficit. It is unbelievable what has happened with respect to our bilateral trade relationship with China. I want to also talk to you about China and trade agreements because I think it is at the root of where we are headed. Automobile trade with China is interesting. "Here Come the Really Cheap Cars," says Time magazine.

Chinese pirate companies have long been accused of illegally copying easy stuff such as shoe polish and digital movies. Now General Motors says a Chinese firm knocked off an entire vehicle—and Americans could soon start buying its cars.

Let me tell you a story about Chinese cars. We have this giant trade deficit with China. We have massive numbers of jobs, this giant sucking sound of American jobs rushing to China, to Bangladesh and Indonesia and Mexico but especially China. We negotiate a trade deal with China. This gets to the root of my contention that our trade negotiators are basically incompetent. I don't say that lightly. I say it because it is true. Let me describe the bilateral automobile provisions of trade with China that our country negotiated. We negotiated a bilateral deal and we said: By the way, with respect to the sale and movement of automobiles between China and the United States, here is what we will agree to. We will agree that after a phase-in, any U.S. cars that are sold in China, you can impose a 25-percent tariff on the cars we want to sell in China. And the United States, we will impose a 2.5-percent tariff on Chinese cars you want to move here.

Our negotiators said to a country with which we have a huge trade deficit: You can impose a tariff that is 10 times higher on American cars we want to sell in China than on Chinese cars they want to sell in America.

Why on Earth would someone agree to that? It is fundamentally unsound. It doesn't make any sense. China has nearly 1.4 billion people. They have 20 million automobiles on the roads. By the year 2020, they will have 120 million cars on the road. That means in the next 15 years, they will add 100 million cars. I can talk about the consequences for oil and energy issues with respect to that, but here is a market with 1.4 billion people for 100 million additional